

1-4-03

Me FU and Eric Anthony

"In our era, Court has to be disregarded - there's no time for ~~the~~ <sup>Congress</sup> to be involved."

~~Also~~ NOT "Beamer" - if every miner are  
on the way...

BUT in this case, if print one "stealthy"  
vehicles, there will be trail for Press to  
\ and at Work

be involved with — obligated nothing will  
work — and will work.

In other cases, Pres should not be making the decision — and there is time to consult Congress

(before last, with decision)

|| but has any Pms ever done so?

LOOK AT ACTUAL CASES OF THREATS

Is there any record of a PWS  
committing any crime of Congress?

or, are there plans?

Has any member of Congress ever

said, "Pete should not use FC on his own"?

(look up 1968 books, Kde book — maybe there  
1954, 1958 Quarry?

C-II ?

HYP: The reason Congress abdicates/delays

to Pino is one way, is to support his  
making nuclear threats (with no say voices)

saying "No" or public being alerted (J. Cong. leads);

and support buying and that back up

have threats - without taking responsibility

To make  
credible  
threats of  
war —  
we must be

controlled by  
Pres/ind, Not

prevalence of  
substance in Congress

Cubick wood

also write  
protest of

albis,

constr. threats,

on perception

This must be decided in secret.

(by a militarist: civ or mil)

a form of  
Convent  
Action



Preparation: Destruction of a city  
(and all in it — but see Old Testament:  
Heng I)

is not justified for any purpose

ie. proportionate revenge

or, carrying out a <sup>deterrent</sup> threat, ~~deterrence~~ <sup>off</sup>

or: "saving lives," by carrying  
summers  
(Nuclear, Tokyo)

Too strict? (!)

Jh: 100 cities

or 1000 cities — New Winter!

Most humans believe that it is justified  
to prepare for, and threaten  
nuc attacks on cities — TO DETER  
such attacks; AND EVEN TO DETER (OR RESPOND) TO  
LARGE-SCALE INVASION

This (and SB) has blown apart all  
earlier ~~a~~ "moral" considerations of  
constraints on violence —

Is it worthwhile to attempt to  
reconstruct "moralif" (or notions of Just War)  
to apply to these choices?

Does experience give a basis of hope  
this might be useful?

(There is still revolution and construction (though not  
much action: frontier or frontier) AT DELIBERATE NON-NUC  
MASSORE.



How relevant is it to learn that  
most Americans "don't support"  
or don't prefer  
actual EU even in response to new attack  
on Europe

wh: that is the plan, & perhaps

there is no effective opposition to  
it in US, or even Europe

despite  
"free press"  
and anti-  
war movement

hardly any know that it is  
the plan (though that is not  
classified, and is proclaimed by US in Europe<sup>\*</sup>)

(cf. US public belief that SH was  
behind 9-11<sup>\*</sup>)

US public ignorance of A.W.H. book<sup>\*</sup>  
US public ignorance of Hiroshima decision

The public belief that <sup>all</sup> top gov officials  
believed in May-August 45 that the  
Japanese would refuse to surrender on acceptable  
IS ~~FLAT~~ WRONG! then withdrew an invasion  
(of the Bunker) and walked in with an  
invasion (without the Bunker)  
— fight to the death, with no surrender,  
unless the Bunker was used.

(IS ~~was~~ FLAT WRONG.

most believed (see SI) the Japanese  
would surrender before an invasion  
was scheduled (Nov / Feb) without  
the Bunker.



threated, it's not as bad as if they  
did support FV.

But:

1) you have to convince them of  
real plus + pros

2) you have to convince them that the  
threat is wrong and/or too risky

3) they have to come enough to prevent  
it, or threat/pros, that they vote, note,  
lobby, and... enough to counterbalance  
pro- lobby.

Note came big wave for bunker-busters  
to destroy a "rogue states stockpile  
unengaged

How much attraction? and if  
one has been used ?!

What public figure would oppose  
NJC O-L, DISARMING, THEN?

(non-use where possible.)

Is this not in our near future?

John: What price Russian blanket  
market arms: + Pakistan...



thanked, it's not as bad as if they  
did support FV.

But:

- 1) you have to convince them of  
real plans + props
- 2) you have to convince them that the  
threat is wrong and/or too risky
- 3) they have to come enough to prevent  
it, or threat/prop, that they vote: vote,  
lobby, and... enough to counterbalance  
pro- lobby.

Note came big wave for bumkin-bumkin  
to destroy a "rogue states stockpile  
underground

How much attraction? esp if  
one has been used?:

What public figure would oppose  
NWC O-L, DISARMING, THEN?

(non-nuc where possible).

Is this not in our near future?

John: What price Russian blanket  
market arms: + Pakistan...